# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 09/941,515 | 08/28/2001 | Eliyahu Marmor | 018/02357 | 7272 |

44909    7590    12/14/2005

WOLF, BLOCK, SCHORR & SOLIS-COHEN LLP
250 PARK AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10177

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| BAROT, BHARAT |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2155 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>9/27/2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.          2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16,18-23,25-27,34-36,38,42-44 and 51-67* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16,18-23,25-27,34-36,38,42-44 and 51-67* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All  b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/10/2005</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

## RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR CONTINUED EXAMINATION (RCE)

1.      Claims 1-16, 18-23, 25-27, 34-36, 38, 42-44, and newly added claims 51-67

remain for further examination.

## The new grounds of rejection

2.      Applicants' arguments and amendments with respect to claims 1-16, 18-23, 25-

27, 34-36, 38, and 42-44 and request for continued examination (RCE) filed on

September 27, 2005 have been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot in

view of the new grounds of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.      The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action.

4.      Claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-20, 22-23, 25-27, 34-36, 38, 42-44, and 51-67 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne et al (U.S. Patent No.

6,006,332) in view of Tso et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,625).

      Rabne teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a rights

management system for digital media  (see abstract).

      As to claim 1, Rabne teaches a method for controlling the viewing of copyrighted

information, transmitted from a data source to a client, on the Internet, comprising:

receiving, by a data source, a request for information from a client (figs. 1b and 2);

transmitting information in an original format, from the data source to a server

responsive to the request (fig. 1b; cols. 10-11, Rabne discloses that information is sent

from the data source to the RM server); converting the information, at the server, from the original format to a modified form, in which the information is less available fro copying than in the original format (figs. 1-2; col. 20 lines 20-40; col. 18, lines 20-60, Rabne discloses that information may be modified by including a watermark as an example and also discloses that the information is viewable but less susceptible to copying when downloaded by the client); transmitting the modified form of the information to the client (col. 20 lines 20-40, Rabne discloses that the modified information is transmitted to the client); and displaying the modified information at the client (figs. 1-15; col. 17-18, Rabne discloses that there is no installation requirement for launching the browser beyond downloading and automatically executing the browser).

Rabne fails to teach the limitation of a proxy. Rabne discloses that modifications to information are done at the RM server (col. 18 lines 20-60).

However, Tso teaches a scaling proxy server that modifies requested objects requested by the clients in accordance with the user's preferences (see abstract). Tso discloses that a proxy modifies the requested data (figs. 2-7; col. 4-6, Tso discloses that a scaling proxy is used to modify information requested by the client).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rabne so that a proxy is used to modify information requested by the client as in Tso. One would be motivated to do so to protect a LAN from unauthorized access over the Internet.

As to claim 2, Rabne teaches the method of claim 1 above, wherein said original format of said information is a format used on the Internet (cols. 14-20).

As to claim 3, Rabne teaches the method of claim 1 above wherein the information is in HTML format (cols. 7-14).

As to claim 5, Rabne teaches the method of claim 2 wherein said displaying comprises displaying by a server provided program (cols. 7-20, Rabne discloses that a special browser program is downloaded to the client for displaying the information requested).

As to claim 6, Rabne teaches the method of claim 5, wherein said program requires a live connection with said server (cols. 7-20).

As to claim 7, Rabne teaches the method according to claim 5, wherein said program is downloaded from the server (cols. 7-20).

As to claim 8, Rabne teaches the method of claim 5 above comprising authenticating the server-provided program to the server (cols. 11-14).

As to claim 9, Rabne teaches the method of claim 5 above, wherein said converting comprises converting said information to a form unusable by said client without said server-provided program (cols. 10-14, Rabne discloses that the information is encrypted such that no other than the rights management browser can decrypt the information).

As to claim 10, Rabne teaches the method according to any of claims 1-3 above, wherein said converting comprises additionally encrypting (cols. 10-14).

As to claim 11, Rabne teaches the method according to any of claims 1-3 above, wherein said converting the information comprises converting only a portion of the information (cols. 10-14).

As to claim 12, Rabne teaches the method according to any of claims 1-3, wherein said converting comprises additionally encoding the information and wherein said information is at least partially decoded before displaying it (cols. 10-14).

As to claims 13-14, Rabne teaches the method of claim 1 above.

Rabne fails to teach the limitation wherein said converting comprises modifying some of the information so that the displayed information differs from the original in format.

However, Tso teaches a scaling proxy server that modifies requested objects requested by the clients in accordance with the user's preferences (see abstract). Tso discloses that encoding and decoding comprises modifying some of the information so that the displayed information differs from the original in format (col. 14, Tso discloses that the information requested may be sent in a format different from that of the original).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rabne so that information is encoded and decoded so that it is displayed in a format different from that of the original. One would be motivated to do so to prevent the client from downloading an alternative decoder.

As to claim 15, Rabne teaches the method of claim 1 above.

Rabne fails to teach the limitation wherein said server acts as a proxy server to transparently convert and transmit the requested information to the client without requiring substantial changes to said data source.

However, Tso teaches a scaling proxy server that modifies requested objects requested by the clients in accordance with the user's preferences (see abstract). Tso discloses that a proxy transparently encodes the requested data (figs. 2-7; cols. 4-6, Tso discloses that a scaling proxy is used to encode information requested by the client).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rabne so that a proxy is used to transparently convert information requested by the client as in Tso. One would be motivated to do so to protect a LAN from unauthorized access over the Internet.

As to claim 16, Rabne teaches the method of claim 15 above, wherein said server does not require substantial changes in said client (cols. 6-14).

Rabne fails to teach the limitation of a proxy. Rabne discloses that modifications to information are done at the RM server (col. 18 lines 20-60).

However, Tso teaches a scaling proxy server that modifies requested objects requested by the clients in accordance with the user's preferences (see abstract). Tso discloses that a proxy modifies the requested data (figs. 2-7; cols. 4-6, Tso discloses that a scaling proxy is used to modify information requested by the client).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Rabne so that a proxy is used to modify information requested by the client as in Tso. One would be motivated to do so to protect a LAN from unauthorized access over the Internet.

As to claims 18-19, Rabne teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said transmitting is in response to said client request, and wherein said server performs conversion on demand by the data source, and wherein said information is compiled from multiple sources at the data source (figs. 1-15; cols. 10-20).

As to claim 20, Rabne teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said conversion modifies at least one text object to at least one non-text object (col. 20, Rabne discloses that text objects in a browser window transmitted from the source server may be grayed out).

As to claim 22, Rabne teaches the method of claim 19, wherein said source is a web server (cols. 10-20).

As to claim 23, Rabne teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said conversion reduces the ability of intercepting said information (cols. 9-14).

Claims 25-27, 34-36, 38, and 42-44 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-20, and 22-23 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

As to claims 51-53, Rabne teaches the method of claim 1, wherein transmitting in a format suitable for display by the client using a standard browser, transmitting the information directly to the client, and converting to a format in which display of the information is easily accessible to the senses of a consumer, but is less accessible to data manipulation tools on a computer performing the display (figs. 1-15; cols. 17-18 and 20).

As to claims 54-55, Rabne teaches the method of claim 1, wherein converting to a format not supported by a simple browser and displaying by the simple browser using an applet (figs 2-5 and 14-15; cols. 11-14).

As to claim 56, Rabne teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said server-provided program is downloaded from the server without user intervention (col. 14 lines 44-53).

Claims 57-67 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

5.      Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne in view of Tso and further in view of Chaddha et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,621,660).
        Rabne teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a rights management system for digital media  (see abstract).

As to claim 4, Rabne teaches method of claims 1-3 above wherein said modifying comprises hindering copying of the information (cols. 17-20, Rabne discloses that the ability to clip/ or download information is hindered by the downloaded browser).

The combination of Rabne and Tso do not teach the limitation of temporally modulating the display of the information.

However, Chaddha teaches a software-based encoder for software implemented end to end scalable video delivery system (see abstract). Chaddha teaches temporally modulating a high resolution data object to lower resolution object (cols. 4-12).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Rabne and Tso by including the temporal modulation as taught by Chaddha to prevent copyrights infringements.


6.      Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rabne in view of Tso and further in view of Gerace (U.S. Patent No. 5,991,735).

Rabne teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a rights management system for digital media  (see abstract).


As to claim 21, Rabne teaches the method of claim 1 above.

The combination of Rabne and Tso fail to teach the limitation wherein said encoding converts at least part of a static object to a dynamic object.

However, Gerace teaches a system and method for customized web page display to users based on user's behavior (see abstract). Gerace teaches wherein said modifying converts at least part of a static object to a dynamic object and inserting advertisements (cols. 14-15, Gerace teaches that a static entry in a client's portfolio is encode such that a flickering screen ticker appears to the client viewing the stocks web page).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Rabne and Tso in view of Gerace to affect conversion of static content to dynamic content. One would be motivated to do so to target users having an interest in particular information.

## Response to Arguments

7.     Applicant's arguments have been fully considered.  The examiner has attempted

to answer (response) to the remarks (arguments) in the body of the Office action.

## Additional Reference

8.     The examiner as of general interest cites the following reference.

a.     Iwase et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,871,243.

## Contact Information

9.     Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to **Bharat Barot** whose Telephone Number is **(571)**

**272-3979**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 9:30 AM to

6:00 PM. Most facsimile-transmitted patent application related correspondence is

required to be sent to the Central FAX Number **(571) 273-8300**.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, **Saleh Najjar**, can be reached at **(571) 272-4006**.

*Bharat Barot.*

**BHARAT BAROT**
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

Patent Examiner Bharat Barot

Art Unit 2155

December 08, 2005